



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/750,180

12/31/2003

Vibhu Mittal

GOOGP018

4999

23689

7590

06/30/2006

Jung-hua Kuo

Attorney At Law

PO Box 3275

Los Altos, CA 94024

EXAMINER

HUYNH, THU V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/750,180

Applicant(s)

MITTAL, VIBHU

Examiner

Thu V. Huynh

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/31/03; 5/11/05
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: IDS filed on 12/31/03 and 05/11/05; and application filed on 12/31/03.
2. Claims 1-28 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 11 and 20 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 12/31/03 and 05/11/05. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. **Claims 8 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1. Claim 8 recites the limitation “wherein the identifying, deriving, generating, and automatically associated are performed for each of the plurality pieces of text”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim, since claim 1 does not recite the associating step is performed “automatically”.

Regarding claim 26, which is dependent on claim 20. Claim 26 recites the limitation “wherein the performing the search, computing the anchor text”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim, since claim 20 does not recite search and computing anchor text.

For examining this application, Examiner assumes that such cited limitations are not included in its dependent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. **Claims 20-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.**

Regarding claims 20-28, these claims are for a computer program embodied on a computer-readable medium to perform the method of claim 1. However, in application specification page 13, paragraph 34 indicates that computer-readable medium are carrier waves, which is not limited to embodiments which fall within a statutory category of invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. **Claims 1-5, 8-14, 17-23 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being**

anticipated by Goodisman et al., US 2002/0069223 A1, published 06/06/02.

Regarding independent claim 1, Goodisman teaches the steps of:

- locating a text reference in a source document (Goodisman, [0053], locating an object in the document in a document including text reference, such as a word, a group of words, numbers or other object in the document);
- identifying a target document relating to a text reference (Goodisman, [0039],[0053]; [0059]; identifying a target document related to the text reference);
- deriving an anchor text corresponding to the target document utilizing the source document (Goodisman, [0053]; obtaining and modifying the object to a link to target document when the object is activated/selected);
- generating a hyperlink to the target document (Goodisman, [0053], [0059]; selecting/clicking the object causing retrieving and displaying the target document); and
- associated the hyperlink with the anchor text (Goodisman, [0053]; automatically associating the hyperlink with the object by linkify engine so that selecting/clicking the object causing retrieving and displaying the target document).

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches deriving the text reference based on a statistical model of at least one of the text formatting and lexical cues (Goodisman, [0053]; parsing the document based on format, type and “linguistic, keyword proximity and word sequence analysis”).

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches comparing text from the source document with a list of predetermined references (Goodisman, [0053]; pattern matcher includes “linguistic, keyword proximity and word sequence analysis”).

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches locating a label corresponding to the text reference and associated the hyperlink with the label (Goodisman, [0053], [0024]; locating objects, such as text reference, figures or trademark in a document).

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Goodisman teaches deriving the label on a statistical model of at least one of text formatting and lexical cues (Goodisman, [0053]; parsing the document based on format, type).

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches parsing the text reference into a plurality pieces of text, wherein the identifying, deriving, generating, and automatically associating are performed for each of the plurality pieces of text (Goodisman; [0024];[0053]; wherein the object is a word in stead of a sentence or group of word)

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Goodisman teaches wherein the source document is selected from the group consisting of an HTML document, a text document, a postscript document, a Portable Document Format (PDF) document, a PowerPoint document, a Word document, and Excel document and a close-captioned video (Goodisman, [0030],[0050]).

Art Unit: 2178

Claims 11-14 and 17-19 are for a computer system performing the method of claims 1-5, 8-10, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 20-23 and 26-28 are for a computer readable medium including instructions performing the method of claims 1-5, 8-10, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. **Claims 6, 15 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Goodisman as applied to claim 4 above and further in view of Glover et al., US

2003/0221163 A1, filed 02/03.

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent on claim 4, Goodisman does not explicitly teach deriving a label anchor text depending on whether the label corresponding to the text reference precedes or follows a text phrase.

Glover teaches deriving a label anchor text depending on whether the label corresponding to the text reference precedes or follows a text phrase (Glover, figures 4; [0034]; extended anchortext (410, 414, 418) are extracted including text references before, after or before and after label "Yahoo").

Art Unit: 2178

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Glover's teaching and Goodisman's teaching to extract text before, after or surround the label, since the combination would have provided label anchor text including the label and text surround the label to link to a target document.

Claim 15 is for a computer system performing the method of claim 6 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 24 is for a computer readable medium including instructions performing the method of claim 6 is rejected under the same rationale.

12. Claims 7, 16 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodisman and Glover as applied to claim 6 above and further in view of Hennings et al., US 6,763,496 B1, filed 03/31/99.

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Goodisman does not explicitly teaches the label anchor text is a longest noun phrase extracted from the text phrase following or preceding the label when the label precedes or follows the phrase, respectively.

Hennings teaches anchor text link comprising a phrase, a picture icon, or a phrase and an icon (Hennings, col.2, lines 54-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hennings' teaching into Goodisman and Glover's teaching to extract a phrase before, after the label, since the combination would have provided

Art Unit: 2178

label anchor text including a phrase before or after the label; or combination of a phrase before or after the label and an the label (object such as icon, image, trademark, identifier).

Claim 16 is for a computer system performing the method of claim 6 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 25 is for a computer readable medium including instructions performing the method of claim 6 is rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Dozier, US 2003/0135826 A1, filed 06/02, teaches method for hyperlink names.

Rosenoff et al., US 7,003,719 B1, filed 01/99, teaches method for inserting hyperlink into documents.

Utiyama et al., US 2002/0083045 A1, filed 12/01, teaches information retrieval method.

Nielsen, US 6,199,071 B1, filed 04/97, teaches method for archiving hypertext documents.

Corbin, US 6,295,542 B1, filed 10/98, teaches method for cross-referencing text.

Golovchinsky et al., US 2004/0078757 A1, filed 08/01, teaches detection and processing of annotated anchors.

Art Unit: 2178

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu V. Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Thu V. Huynh
June 23, 2006